REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-11 are amended. Claims 1-11 remain in the Application. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

I. Claims Objections

Claims 4-11 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form. Applicants amend Claims 4-11 to remove the multiple dependency of these claims. Approval of the amendment is respectfully requested.

II. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,264,861 issued to Roederere et al. ("Roederere"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Roederere discloses a circular polarization wire antenna including a series of strands being powered by the same conducting wire.

However, Roederere neither discloses nor suggests an antenna with a series of strands which are in the same main plane. On the contrary, each strand (8-10) of the antenna of Roederere comprises a non-radiating horizontal rod and a radiating curvilinear rod inclined at an angle to the horizontal plane of said horizontal rod (col. 2, lines 60-61). Thus, the curvilinear rod and the horizontal rods are not in a single main plane as claimed.

Moreover, Roederere does not disclose an antenna with each of the strands describing an initial segment which is radial relative to a geometric axis perpendicular to the main plane, and each of the strands extending along a circle arc centered on this geometric axis, and describing a substantially radial segment directed in the direction of the geometric axis, thus running alongside a radial segment of a neighboring strand without touching the neighboring strand.

Finally, Roederere neither discloses nor suggests an antenna made by patch technology. Indeed, even if Roederere discloses the possibility to use a printed circuit plane to join the different curvilinear strands of the antenna, said antenna is a wire antenna wherein said printed circuit plane is destined to replace the horizontal rods which do not contribute to the radiation and which are not the radiating strands.

The claimed device relates to a circular polarization antenna which is simple to make and has a reduced size. The claimed antenna is made by patch technology and presents a specific configuration of its radiating strands.

The antenna has a series of strands located substantially in a single main plane, each of the strands being powered by a single conducting wire and each of these strands describes an initial segment which is radial relative to a geometric axis perpendicular to the main plane, and each of the strands is extended along a circle arc centered on this geometric axis, and describes again a substantially radial segment directed in the direction of the geometric axis, thus running alongside a radial segment of a neighboring strand without touching the neighboring strand.

Due to its specific configuration, the claimed antenna is very compact. Typically, its total thickness is of about 0.04λ. (See Applicants' Specification at page 7, lines 8-10).

By contrast, Roederere does not disclose the claimed antenna with respect to its structure, operation, or compactness.

With respect to the structure of the antenna, the antenna of Roederere presents a series of radiating strands which are not in the same main plane and with a configuration different from the ones of the claimed antenna.

With respect to the operation of the antenna, Roederere discloses a wire antenna and more precisely a monopole antenna whereas the claimed antenna is an antenna made by patch technology.

Finally, the antenna of Roederere cannot be made as compact as the claimed antenna. The total thickness of the antenna of Roederere is at least λ/2 since the conductive rod of the antenna extends over a length of at least λ/2.

The antenna of Roederere is a monopole wire antenna wherein the ends have been charged by strands. It is generally known in the art that a wire antenna and a patch antenna cannot present the same dimensions or the same type of operation. A monopole wire antenna is radically different from a patch antenna. The two antennae are defined with a resonant structure in wire and in surface, respectively.

It is also known that the size of a monopole antenna is, in general, λ/4 or λ/2. Roederere neither discloses nor suggests the use of patch technology to realize an antenna of a reduced size.

Accordingly, Roederere does not teach each of the elements of Claim 1. Claims 2-11 depend from Claim 1 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, for at least the same reasons

mentioned above in regard to Claim 1, Roederere does not anticipate these dependent Claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-11 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If there are any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge those fees to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: April, 28, 2006

Eric S. Hyman, Reg. No. 30,139

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Suzanne Johnston 4/28/06
Date